Claims 26 and 27 have been canceled. No new matter has been added. Claims 11, 13 to 25, 28, and 29 are pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of this Response.

Claims 26 and 27 have been canceled. In view of such, any rejections to claims 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112, 103(a) are now moot.

Claims 11 to 21 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,909,705 to Lee et al. ("Lee reference") in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0054578 to Zhang et al. ("Zhang reference") and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0035699 to Crosbie ("Crosbie reference"). Applicants note that claim 12 was canceled in Applicants' earlier submission.

The Lee reference appears to concern integrating a Bluetooth network with a cellular networks, so that the Bluetooth network can be utilized more. The Zhang reference appears to concern a cross-layer architecture for "delivering multiple media streams over 3G W-CDMA channels in adaptive multimedia wireless networks." Specifically, the Zhang reference refers to a resource management mechanism allocating resources among different media streams, and such allocation is performed based on a minimum-distortion or minimum power criterion. The Crosbie reference appears to concern a seamless roaming system and refers to a gateway server providing context information, such as an IP address, that is stored after being previously allocated to a mobile device in a previous connection to the WLAN and reassigning the IP address to the mobile device after it reconnects to the WLAN after a disconnection, thus providing seamless roaming for the mobile device from WLAN to WLAN (or subnets within one WLAN) without requiring the user of the device to re-register. The Crosbie reference also refers to the gateway server as providing load balancing among two or more WLAN's by directing a newly connection mobile device to another WLAN (or subnet), if less congestion results.

In contrast, claim 11 is directed to a method for exchanging data using a wireless connection, and requires at least monitoring a movement of the at least one portable terminal across a boundary of the at least one network, and wherein for the data exchange, the transmission channel is adapted automatically *to a type* of the at least one portable terminal and a *type of data* to be transmitted, by an administrator to be assigned to the network, and the type of the at least one portable terminal and the type of data to be transmitted is

provided to the administrator *via at least one of a predefined user profile and a message transmitted to the administrator from the at least one portable terminal.* None of the references, alone or in combination, appear to teach or describe providing a transmission channel available for the exchanging *data* within a framework of the connection established; and monitoring a movement of the at least one portable terminal across a boundary of the at least one network by an administrator – not just the BTS or BT Hub which contains the routing tables for the nodes of the Bluetooth network or WLAN to WLAN. Further, the RLC referred to by the Zhang reference, for example, cannot be viewed as the administrator referred to by the present claims because the RLC is specific to one logical channel layer – and does not assist a user across and between different networks and possible multiple data channels. Further, none of the references teach or describe the type of the at least one portable terminal and the type of data to be transmitted is provided to the administrator via at least one of a predefined user profile and a message transmitted to the administrator from the at least one portable terminal as required in amended claim 11. The references do not discuss utilizing a predefined user profile or use of a transmitted message, e.g., a message header of an email, which indicates to the administrator what is in line for transmission, and what has priority, if any, for sending.

As a further comment, Applicants respectfully submit that at least the Lee and Zhang references are not combinable since one reference concerns itself with essentially providing more Bluetooth device connectivity opportunities and the other reference concerns itself with multiple media streams over 3G. While one strives for potential cost savings for transmission of voice *and* data, the other is appears to focus on handoffs between networks such that a quality of service is maintained and guaranteed.

Claim 11 as well as claim 25 which recites features analogous to claim 11, are believed allowable over the Lee, Zhang, and Crosbie references. Likewise, the dependent claims 13 to 21 depend from claim 11 and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons over the Lee, Zhang, and Crosbie references as claim 11. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of claims 11, 13 to 21, and 25 is respectfully requested.

Claims 22 to 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over the Lee reference in view of the Crosbie reference. Claims 26 and 27 have been canceled. Claims 28 and 29 depend from claim 11, and are believed allowable over at least the Lee and Crosbie references for at least the same reasons as discussed above. As discussed briefly above, claim 25

describes features analogous to those of claim 11, and is believed allowable over at least the Lee and Crosbie references. Accordingly, allowance of claims 25, 28, and 29 is respectfully requested.

Claim 22 and its dependent claims 23 and 24 are believed allowable over the Lee and Crosbie references since claim 22 recites features analogous to those of claim 11. Further, claim 22 is directed to an administrator, and requires that "the router module determines a type of data waiting for transmission and establishes a connection corresponding to the type of data to the terminal, the connection established being optimized in view of at least one of the terminal, costs, and transmission speed" and "the type of the at least one portable terminal and the type of data to be transmitted is provided to the administrator via at least one of a predefined user profile and a message transmitted to the administrator from the at least one portable terminal." The Lee and Crosbie references do not teach or suggest such features as optimizing effort in the use of connections as claimed nor for an administrator using a predefined user profile and transmitted message as contemplated by the present invention. Accordingly, allowance of those claims 22 to 24 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that any outstanding rejections of the claims as now amended have been overcome, and that all claims 11, 13 to 25, 28, and 29 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

To assist in the prosecution of this application, Applicants respectfully request an interview with the Examiner to discuss the above Response.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 15, 2011   By: /Linda Lecomte/_____
                                Linda Lecomte (Reg. No. 47,084)

CUSTOMER NO. 26646   KENYON & KENYON LLP
                                One Broadway
                                New York, New York 10004
                                (212) 425-7200

8